

ARGUMENT

Declaration by Author(s) or Proponent(s) (Elections Code §9600)

"The i	undersigned author(s) of the:
	argument in favor of
	argument against
	rebuttal to the argument in favor of
	rebuttal to the argument against
Augu	measure (letter to be assigned by the Santa Clara County Registrar of Voters on st 12th) at the Consolidated Municipal Election for the City of Mountain View to be held on on the state that such argument is true and correct to the best of knowledge and belief. (his/her/their)
ARGU	JMENT/REBUTTAL FILED BY (check any of the following that apply):
	City Council Contact Person's TYPED Name: Contact Person's Signature: Title: Phone: E-Mail: AUG 1 5 7716
	Bona Fide Association of Citizens or Filers Name of Association: Principal Officer's TYPED Name: Principal Officer's Signature: Title: Phone: E-Mail:
X	Individual voter who is eligible to vote on the measure TYPED Name: Signature of Voter: Address Where You Live: 707 Countries for Circle 427, Mts. Vicus CA 94040 Phone: 408-887-5070 Fax: E-Mail:

SIGNATURE STATEMENT - PAGE 2

CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING & NOTE THAT THE LETTER OF MEASURE WILL BE ASSIGNED BY THE

SANTA CLARA COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ON AUGUST 12th:

Argument in Favor of Measure _____

Argument Aga	ainst Measure rgument in Favor of Measure rgument Against Measure			
The signatures of	the following persons below	w will be printed <u>as submi</u>	itted following the argument or	rebuttal.
SIGNATURE	TYPE NAME as it will appear in the Voter's Information Pamphlet	TYPE TITLE & NAME OF ASSOCIATION (IF APPLICABLE) as it will appear in the Voter's Information Pamphlet	ARE YOU SIGNING ON BEHALF OF AN ASSOCIATION? Yes or No. If no, and you are signing as an individual voter, please provide address of where you live.	DATE
1. bys Wany	Gary Wesley Female_Male X	Long-term	No	8-15-16
2.	FemaleMale	00		
3.	FemaleMale			
4.	FemaleMale			
5.	FemaleMale			

C:\Users\wwong\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\YQNL7JJP\November 8 2016 Argument Booklet 08-12-16 (3).doc



AUG 1 5 2016



With every member of the Mountain View City Council (except Lenny Siegel) having been endorsed as a candidate by a landlord-advocacy group, it was no surprise that residential tenants faced with steep rent increases received no significant help from the City Council.

So, starting in April, residents launched an initiative petition (signature) drive and qualified for the November ballot a proposed rent control-just cause eviction law (to become part of the city charter).

In response, the landlord-endorsed City Council majority devised this rent increase "arbitration" ordinance and placed it on the November ballot as a competing measure.

The effect of this additional measure could be to split the votes in support of holding down some residential rents and cause the defeat of the initiative. Some have called the maneuver a "DIRTY TRICK."

Indeed, there is a legal issue about whether the City Council even had the authority to place this proposed ordinance on the city ballot. If not legally authorized, passage of this measure would NOT result in its enactment into law.

If you believe that some restrictions should be placed on raising rents for some existing residential tenants, you should consider voting for the other (initiative) measure on the Mountain View ballot.

EVICTIONS INVITED. The landlord-endorsed City Councilmembers who placed this competing measure on the ballot failed to even outlaw an easy way around even its modest restriction on increasing rents on existing tenants (in covered units): simply evict tenants instead of raising their rent! At most, a landlord might have to provide some "relocation assistance."

YOU MAY VOTE FOR BOTH CITY BALLOT MEASURES. But no one should be tricked into voting against the initiative in hope that this competing measure might become law and actually help anyone stay in Mountain View.

